

REMARKS

Claims 12-23 are pending in the present application. All of the pending claims stand rejected. Claim 12 has been amended by this amendment and no new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claim 12 may be found, for example, on page 4, lines 28-30 of the original English specification. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections based on the following remarks.

Claims 12-14 and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nguyen (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,848) in view of Jonsson (U.S. Patent No. 5,966,660"). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent Claim 12, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of this claim.

Nguyen discloses a call back service that is used only when a called party is busy and cannot be reached. As illustrated in Figs. 7A-C of Nguyen, a calling party requests service from a SCP for call completion as illustrated in steps 279 and 281 of Fig. 8A. The call completion requests includes a feature code, such as *66, to indicate that automatic call back services desired. The A-number (i.e., the telephone number of a calling mobile station 151) and the B-number (i.e., the number of a called mobile station 145) are included in the call completion request. See, column 11, line 54 through column 12, line 4.

The SCP attempts to setup a connection to the B-party and, as soon as the B-party is no longer occupied, a connection is then established and a connection to the A-party is created by establishing a trunk 155 from a mobile switching center 141 serving the B-party to a mobile switching center 147 serving the A-party. See, column 12, lines 5-40. Subsequently, the entire connection is switched through and the SCP sets up trunks 153 and 155 between the mobile switching center 147 and a mobile switching center 37 and between mobile switching center 37 and mobile switching center 141 as illustrated in Fig. 5 and discussed in column 12, lines 43-46.

Nguyen, however, does not teach or suggest any other order of setting up trunks 153 and 155 than the A-party (i.e., mobile switching center 151) being the calling party in the established connection. In contrast, claim 12 features "initiating a first call set-up to the calling party where

the calling party becomes a called entity and initiating a second call set-up to the call party where the call party becomes a calling entity.” Nguyen simply does not teach or suggest this feature.

Furthermore, Jonsson is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of these claimed features. As argued in the Applicants’ previous response, Jonsson merely describes a connection set-up between a PBX and another terminal device, the connection setup being controlled by a different mobile radio device or by the PBX. The reference also possesses no teaching or suggestion of mobile stations and switching centers being located in different sub-networks. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Jonsson does not make up for the shortcomings of Nguyen and submit that Nguyen and Jonsson, either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 12.

With respect to dependent claims 13, 14, and 17-22, these claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons presented with respect to independent claim 12 and also are believed to be allowable on their merits.

Claims 15-16 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen and Jonsson and further in view of Joensuu (U.S. Patent No. 5,924,035). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

With respect to claims 15 and 16, these claims are believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 12 and also on their merits.

With respect to independent claim 23, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of this claim. In particular, claim 23 features “expanding an unstructured supplementary service data (USSD) string, which is part of the service call, in the home location register and forwarding the service call with the expanded USSD string to a service control point.” Although the present Office Action maintains that Joensuu teaches this features, this assertion is false. Specifically, Fig. 2 of Joensuu merely illustrates the transmission of a USSD message 80 to a home mobile service center 20a, which, in turn, reviews header data 90 in the USSD message 80 and determines whether message 80 needs to be forwarded to a home location register 10. An encapsulated NPA number in the USSD message is extracted by the home location register 10 and stored in a memory register 130 for future utilization. No teaching or suggestion is given in Joensuu, however, that the home location register actually expands the USSD string or forwards a service call with an expanded

string to a service control point. Thus, Joensuu simply does not teach or suggest the features of claim 23 for which it is relied upon. Additionally, Nguyen and Jonsson do not teach or suggest this feature as recognized in the present Office Action. Accordingly, claim 23 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art because these references come either combined or taken separately, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claim.

In light of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: April 26, 2004